



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Épigraphie. Extrait du Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique I, col. 1404-57. By L. JALABERT. Paris: Beauchesne et Cie, 1910.

Christian inscriptions have an importance for the classical scholar as well as for the student of church history and theology. It is therefore not inappropriate that the reprint of M. Jalabert's article should be noticed in *Classical Philology*. The reputation of the author is warrant for the value of his work. This is divided into two unequal parts. The first deals with the elements of Christian epigraphy, such as the dating, diffusion, formulas, etc., of the inscriptions; the second, and the major part, is entitled "L'Apologétique des Inscriptions." Here M. Jalabert first discusses the contribution of the inscriptions to the elucidation of the New Testament on matters of text, history, and archaeology; he then considers their testimony as to the history of the church, treating such matters as the environment into which Christianity came, the spread of the church, its unity, struggles, and divisions, as well as things concerning its inner life—the *credo*, sacraments, worship, ecclesiastical institutions, and Christian morality.

Although it is clear from this brief outline that the classical philologist will be concerned chiefly with the first part of M. Jalabert's work, the second cannot be neglected by those who are interested in Greco-Roman civilization as a whole.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

A. *Persii Flacci, D. Iunii Iuvenalis, Sulpiciae Saturae*. Recognovit OTTO JAHN. Post Francisci Buecheleri Iteratas Curas Editionem Quartam Curavit FRIEDERICHUS LEO. Berolini Apud Weidmannos. Pp xxiv+304.

To those who have read Leo's two articles in *Hermes* XLIV, pp. 600 ff., "Doppelfassungen bei Juvenal," and *ibid.*, XLV, pp. 43 ff., "Zum Text des Persius und Juvenal," the point of view which he adopts in this fourth revision of the well-known Jahn-Buecheler edition of Persius and Juvenal is already familiar. I turn first to Persius. Leo refuses his assent to the doctrine of Jahn *Proleg.*, p. ccxv, *kl. Ausg.*, p. 5, and Buecheler *Rh. Mus.* XLI, pp. 454 ff. that the text of Persius is preserved by our MSS in essential purity. It will be remembered that both Jahn in his *editio minor* of 1868, and Buecheler in his second edition are inclined to give a decided preference to the readings of *a*, the common archetype of A, Montepessulanus 212, and B, codex Vaticanus H 36, over P, Montepessulanus 125. Bieger in his dissertation, *De Persii codice Pithoeano C recte aestimando* (Berlin, 1890), deserves the credit of pointing out the necessity of giving fuller recognition to the claims of P, and less regard to the recension of Sabinus represented by

a. Buecheler in his third edition (1893) accepts essentially the results of this dissertation. In the present edition comes Leo, who denies the dictum of Jahn and Buecheler that the consensus of A, B, and P gives essentially a pure text, and pleads for a careful collation of the once discredited class S. Certain variant readings of MSS in this class, he argues (cf. p. xvii *praef.*), are by no means all due to conjecture, but in some cases at least seem to evidence in their corruptions a tradition differing from both P and *a*. A complete collation of these MSS is therefore, as Leo rightly holds, a necessity for the proper textual study of Persius. The present edition does not rest upon such a collation, but as representing the readings of a typical MS of this unclassified group, Leo gives the readings of a *codex Laurentianus* 37, 19 (L), first carefully collated by Felix Ramorino *Stud. Ital. di Filol. Cl. XII* (1904), pp. 229 ff. In addition we have Owen's collation of the two Montpellier MSS, and a new collation of Vaticanus B made by Pasquali.

With the general principle here laid down the reviewer agrees. Indeed L for example (cf. *Praef.* p. xviii) preserves certain good readings free from the corruptions of both P and *a*. It would seem, however, that at times Leo is somewhat more free in admitting and suggesting conjectures than is properly consistent with our present agnostic attitude toward the text tradition of Persius. Thus in 5. 110 the interpretation of an interrogative potential subjective seems permissible, and not to have been questioned by Jahn and Buecheler. In 2. 55 even though we are not sure of the explanation of the scholia, one hesitates to accept *patres* on the basis of Lucilius (frag. 20 ff.) where we have a council of the gods, *likened to the Roman senate*. Némethy following the scholia gives a correct interpretation of *fratres*. Indeed Juvenal 13. 150-52 seems to be an imitation of our passage and refers directly to Castor. On the other hand the interpretation of *ovato* is convincing, though one would wish that the *ō* might be worked into the line in the place of the conjecture *et ovo*. The argument for the incompleteness of the sixth satire carries conviction. But the problems presented by the text of Persius are after all much less intricate than those calling for decision in the text of Juvenal since Winstedt's discovery. Previous to Winstedt's discovery the *stemma* of the MSS of Juvenal was comparatively simple. Jahn's *editio maior* of 1851 was held to have established the supremacy of P. More or less closely related to P were the Aarau fragments discovered by Wirz, the Bobbio palimpsest, and the florilegium of St. Gall. All the other MSS of Juvenal were relegated to an inferior or interpolated class *ω*, whose text, though on the whole inferior to P, is yet sufficiently often in agreement with P to render any clear-cut distinction from this better MS impossible (cf. Wilson's *Juvenal*, pp. xxvi ff.) All the MSS of this inferior class can be shown to go back to a recension made by Nicaeus. Buecheler indeed in distinction from Jahn and perhaps a majority of Juvenal students held that not only the *ω* class but P. A as well go back to the Nicaean recension (cf. p. 114 in Friedlaender's edition).

Inevitably the lines of a new *stemma* must be traced as the result of the discovery of Winstedt. Here we have a MS of the ω class that is more often in agreement with P than any of its fellows, and which in addition to the passages between vi. 365 and 366, and between 373 and 374 contains new readings of merit, not found in either P or the other MSS of the ω class so far examined. The pressing need for the critical study of Juvenal is therefore the collations and appraisal of all the MSS of this once discredited ω class. Leo's text does not rest upon such a complete collation, but a glance at his *conspectus librorum* (cf. p. 70) shows what an important advance has been made in the last 17 years in recognizing the rights of ω . In other words, although in a sense Leo's edition is a "stop-gap" appearing at a period before a complete re-examination of all Juvenal MSS could be made, we have an apparatus, which in fulness, clearness, and logical arrangement represents a great advance over the three preceding minor editions. To mention new additions of especial value to the *apparatus criticus* we now have (1) a new collation of the Araau fragments (A); (2) the readings of Parisinus 8072 (B), a brother not a copy of P, from Stuart's collation (cf. *Class. Rev. III* [1909], p. 109; (3) the *fragmentum Ambrosianum* (F), found by Ratti in 1909 and containing 14. 250-56, 268-91, 303-19; (4) Housman's collation of Parisinus 7900 A (G) and Urbinas 661 (U) which are now shown to stand close together in their common agreements with P, and whose consensus is therefore indicated by (γ); (5) the readings recorded under ϕ and ω are apparently based upon the examination of all the Vatican *codices* of Juvenal; (6) of value also is the practice of distinguishing the *lemmata* of the scholia by S, the readings gained from their text by sch. It is therefore no great exaggeration to say that in fulness of report, in nicety of notation, and in general critical usability this edition approximates the standard of many maior variorum editions.

In conclusion a word should be said as to Leo's own theory of the text, and the actual text he prints. Leo holds that the text of Juvenal rests upon a double recension; that books i-iv were published by the poet himself, and that after his death a new edition with the addition of book v appeared. Our text he holds goes back to this posthumous edition. After the publication of books i-iv, however, Juvenal (cf. *vita* iv: *in exilio ampliarit satiras et plerasque mutavit*), worked over at least books ii-iv and in a number of passages prepared variant versions of greater or less length. The fifth book he left unfinished. It was published as he left it, and at the same time appeared books i-iv, in the form in which they were finally revised by the poet. Yet though this posthumous edition became the standard, the earlier edition of books i-iv was not entirely suppressed, and some of its variant passages were preserved in MSS of the posthumous edition. The commentator who composed the first annotated edition within a century after Juvenal's death had at his disposal, the first edition of books i-iv, from which he occasionally excerpts such variant renderings. In the

fourth century this commentary was excerpted and republished in a new edition. Pithoeanus and its kin especially represent this fourth-century edition.

For the reconstitution of the text therefore Leo frankly abandons the hypothesis of Buecheler and holds that both P and ω are important in equal degree, except that the text of a MS without commentary is less likely to be reliable. Even till the eleventh century, however, sporadic copies of the first edition of books i-iv survived and from them we have traces of this older recension both in P and in the ω class.

The present edition therefore represents a revolution from the hypothesis of Buecheler, and in a sense a return to certain points of view which found their extreme expression in Ribbeck's *Der Echte und Unechte Juvenal*, and in the better-grounded skepticism of Teuffel's *Stud. und Charakt. zur griech. und röm. Litteraturgesch.*², Leipzig, 1889, p. 549. The edition is likely then to arouse controversy. Indeed Vahlen in 1884, *Ind. lect. aest.*, Berlin, p. 30, spoke of Teuffel's theory of a double recension as *nebulosum commentum*. It would seem to be the part of sane conservatism to suspend final judgment upon the soundness of Leo's theory pending a complete collation of the MSS. At the same time whether we accept or reject the conclusions of Leo's first article in *Hermes* one is bound to recognize that the external argument for Leo's thesis has been greatly strengthened by Winstedt's discovery and by the new light thrown by that discovery upon such notices in the scholia as that of Valla on 6. 614 and by such additions as 6. 558, 559 by P².

A word in closing as to Leo's own text. It was perhaps inevitable that the immediate effect of such a hypothesis, should tend to encourage conjectural emendation, the bracketing of some lines as interpolations, and the indenting of others as showing a variant recension. Not all Juvenal scholars will accept *ducetis* in the vexed 1. 156. The bracketing of 10. 54, as an interpolation seems to spring from too nice stylistic analysis to be applicable to a declamatory satirist like Juvenal. Other passages might be added. On the other hand the emendation of *assiculis* in 14. 269 is attractive. Leo's changes in punctuation in almost all cases are an improvement over Jahn and Buecheler. In some passages previously emended by Buecheler Leo shows the correctness of the MSS. Thus in 6. 166 where he reads *Venusina*, comparing *CIL* VI, 2379 a 57 in place of Buecheler's *Venustina*. It would be instructive to speak of other passages if space permitted. It only remains to add that all students of Latin satire will feel grateful to Leo for the discrimination, clearness, and boldness with which he in this edition has attempted the task of relaying the foundations for the adequate critical study of Persius and Juvenal

G. C. FISKE